

Doc. 300.1.3

Date: Date

Feedback Report from EEC Experts

- **Higher Education Institution:**
Frederick University
- **Town:** Nicosia
- **School/Faculty:** School of Business and Law
- **Department:** Department of Law
- **Programme of study under evaluation**
Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)

In Greek:

Δίκαιο Νέων Τεχνολογιών [3 ακαδημαϊκά εξάμηνα, 90 ECTS, Μεταπτυχιακό (LLM), Εξ αποστάσεως]

In English:

Law of new Technologies [3 academic semesters, 90 ECTS, Master (LLM), E-learning]

- **Language(s) of instruction:** Greek and English
- **Programme's status:** New
- **Concentrations (if any):**

In Greek: Concentrations

In English: Concentrations



The present document has been prepared within the framework of the authority and competencies of the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education, according to the provisions of the “Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Higher Education and the Establishment and Operation of an Agency on Related Matters Laws” of 2015 to 2021 [L.136(I)/2015 – L.132(I)/2021].

A. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Jeanne Mifsud Bonnici	Professor	University of Groningen
Andrew J. Charlesworth	Professor	University of Bristol
Emily Mary Weitzenboeck	Professor	Oslo Metropolitan University
Pantelis Papadopoulos	Professor	University of Twente
Athanasia Eliadou	Student	Open University of Cyprus



B. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

The EEC based on the external evaluation report (Doc.300.1.1 or 300.1.1/2 or 300.1.1/3 or 300.1.1/4) and the Higher Education Institution's response (Doc.300.1.2), must justify whether actions have been taken in improving the quality of the programme of study in each assessment area.

1. Study programme and study programme's design and development (ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)

EEC's final recommendations and comments on the HEI's response

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	EEC's final recommendations and comments on the HEI's response
<p>It is recommended that:</p> <p>1. Title and nature of the programme of study: The programme title is "Law of new technologies and e-government." The taught subjects are preponderantly on the law of new technologies, and less room appears to be dedicated to e-government. One course - DLNLT507 "The New Governance of the Digital Age" - delves into issues of governance and democracy, in particular how "ICT can contribute to the improvement of the exercise of public service competences, contribute to the direction of deliberative and participatory democracy", though this course is an elective.</p> <p>Furthermore, the main programme objectives on page 2 of the application do not clearly refer to e-government (though it makes some reference to the promotion of e-democracy), and a course actually refers to the programme as being a "postgraduate program "Law and New Technologies" (see DLNLT506 "Special Contract Law Topics in the Digital Age" in Annex 2.</p> <p>Furthermore, the application has a long list of specific special learning outcomes (twenty issues), of which only a couple broadly relate to e-government. The EEC recommends that the University reviews the name of the programme and either changes it, for example, to "Law of new technologies" or, if it prefers to retain it as it currently is, to ensure that the programme description, learning objectives, and individual</p>	<p>1.1. To avoid confusion regarding the term e-government, as mentioned in the report, we accept the EEC recommendation for the title: "Law of New Technologies".</p>	<p>Compliance</p>

<p>course outlines and learning objectives clearly show how each of them respectively relates to e-government. The programme would also benefit significantly from an explanation, in the introduction, of what is understood by “e-government”. During the site visit, the EEC noticed that there were considerably varying understandings of what this term entails, among both the University staff, the external assessors and the committee itself.</p>		
<p>2. Inconsistencies: There are some inconsistencies between the shorter-form course descriptions in Annex 2 of the application form and the more detailed course descriptions provided, e.g. the description of the general purpose of the thesis (DLNLT512 Thesis II: Thesis Proposal and Implementation” in Annex 2 refers to there being an emphasis on “the comparative study of Greek and German law”, as well as having, among its more specific objectives, “highlighting and critically evaluating issues of application of the law in practice, through selected case law of Greek and German courts.” There is no such language in the more detailed course description. Such inconsistencies should be removed.</p>	<p>1.2. Some inconsistencies have been already aligned, within the updated version sent to the Committee before the evaluation date. In any case, all inconsistencies have been completely aligned, as may be seen in Annex 1 - Course Descriptions and Study Guides attached to the document.</p>	<p>Compliance</p> <p>However, an overall suggestion to the Institution is to have a closer final editing look at all the descriptions to check for minor glitches, e.g. the study guide of DLNLT512 Thesis on page 8 does not indicate what happens in Meeting 4, and Meeting 5 oddly refers to “the final text of the diplomacy paper” instead of the thesis.</p>
<p>3. Inconsistencies as regard the final exam procedure: The application (page 9) states that the final exam “requires the physical presence of the students”, where page 68 specifies that this is conducted online. During the site visit, it was clarified that the final exam will be done digitally. The programme and all documentation referring to physical exams should be amended.</p>	<p>1.3. Some inconsistencies have been already aligned, within the updated version sent to the Committee before the evaluation date. We apologize for the confusion. As clarified during the onsite visit, the exams will take place online – distance sessions and all respective contradictory references have been modified.</p> <p>The format of the final exams is clearly communicated to</p>	<p>Compliance</p>

	students prior to enrollment in the programme.	
4. References in the course descriptions to “national law” should clarify which national law is being referred to, e.g. is it Cypriot law, Greek law, some other national law?	<p>1.4. EU Law, as implemented in the EU members' national legislation, is the main object of study within the programme.</p> <p>Expected students are more likely to be Cypriot and/or Greek. Thus, National Law refers mainly to Cypriot and/or Greek Law. For students of non-Cypriot and/or Greek heritage, any reference to Cypriot and/or Greek Law is adopted in an indicative way.</p> <p>The clarifications have been updated in Annex 1 - Course Descriptions and Study Guides.</p>	Compliance

2. Student - centred learning, teaching and assessment (ESG 1.3)

EEC's final recommendations and comments on the HEI's response

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	EEC's final recommendations and comments on the HEI's response
Improvements could be made to clarify teaching, monitoring, and assessment policies and the way they are enforced during the runtime of a course, so that corrective actions could be made possible.	2.1. We accept the EEC recommendation. Upon programme operation, the University has prepared for implementation programme-wide Mid-Semester Quality Process that includes: (1) a Week 4–5 survey, (2) learning-analytics monitoring with an early-alert workflow, and (3) a Corrective Action Plan, to implement micro-adjustments within 7 days.	Compliance
Currently, the program counts Week 0 within the five synchronous sessions, which is the minimum number required by CYQAA. Therefore, the students will have only four remaining synchronous sessions with their teacher in their courses. The EEC strongly suggests that Week 0 should not be counted, and an additional, course-related session is added in the programme. While the minimum requirement may be met (after excluding Week 0 from the count), the EEC proposes that more could be done and, whenever possible, the students should be offered more synchronous sessions. Indeed, during the visit, the EEC heard that several teachers hold additional synchronous sessions in their courses, as they see fit. The suggestion by the EEC would be to have, whenever possible, a homogeneous learning experience for the students in the programme. Having an engaging course with several synchronous sessions next to one in which students meet synchronously with their teachers in	2.2. We accept the EEC recommendation. Each course requires 6 plenary synchronous course-related sessions throughout the 13-week semester. The synchronous tele session to be organised in Week 0 (i.e. orientation, non-academic related), are in addition to the 5 tele sessions to take place throughout the semester. The University fully acknowledges and recognizes the added value and benefits for the students to regularly meet in a synchronous mode with the instructors. The schedule is published in each Study Guide, at the courses' LMS pages, and on the LMS calendar.	Compliance However, we would recommend more clarity on the numbering of the sessions e.g. the study guides for the courses DLNLT501 up to and including DLNLT511 do in fact show 6 synchronous sessions instead of just five. Yet, it appears that the sixth synchronous meeting (i.e. Meeting 6) for each of these courses is the final exam (2-3 hours). Meeting 6 is technically not a meeting but an exam. Given that the minimum number required by CYQAA is five synchronous sessions, the level of compliance is achieved, but not completely accurately described.

<p>a plenary session only 4-5 times may have a detrimental effect on students' engagement and the way they evaluate their courses.</p>		
<p>Because of the planned collaborative activities, the EEC's suggestion is to also provide guidance to students on how to effectively and productively work together. This is a critical issue. Students are not usually trained on how to be effective collaborators and collaboration activities may sometimes have negative effects on how students experience their learning.</p>	<p>2.3. We accept the EEC recommendation. The University has added a specific section at the DLICS course (0 credit course) the newcomers DL students attend in regards to collaborative activities and group work, and specifically, student's role and contribution in group work so as to be well prepared to effectively and productively work together. Additionally, the Center for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching, provides the instructors with a team template for collaborative activities and a checklist to be used by the students when they participate in online collaborative activities.</p>	<p>Compliance</p>
<p>Regarding students' access to teachers, the EEC suggests that access to teachers must be clear and welcomed. In that regard, it will be useful to have set hours and a minimum number of hours during the week during which the teachers could be accessible to their students for private consultation. Having said that, the discussion with the students (both ones in conventional and DL programmes) revealed that the students are highly satisfied with the accessibility they have with their teachers and their response times. This is commendable, but this success is still ad hoc and based on the individual investment of each teacher. It would be more productive to have a clear policy in the programme.</p>	<p>2.4. As a standardized process in regards to instructor-student interaction and communication, all instructors are required to schedule and publish one fixed online office hour every week (preferably different than the weeks of the synchronous tele sessions, in order to achieve continuous communication and interaction). Additionally, a 48-hour response window for messages/emails, is already practiced under the Distance Learning Pedagogical Framework. The online office hours schedule is published in each Study Guide, at the courses' LMS pages, and on the LMS calendar.</p>	<p>Compliance</p> <p>But also 1h per course per week is very limited.</p>
<p>As a university teaching qualification (UTQ) and senior teaching qualification (SUTQ) become more common within European</p>	<p>2.5. The two-part DL Instructor Induction course has been developed with explicit learning outcomes and assessment</p>	<p>Compliance</p> <p>But also align it with the ECTS system. Currently, most EU</p>

<p>universities, the EEC strongly suggests a similar approach for the induction course for the teachers. It could also be seen as enhancing the teachers' professional development if such an induction course could lead to a certificate tied to ECs and aligned to European standards.</p>	<p>artifacts. Part B of the Induction is under development, and it is expected to be available in Spring 2026. Successful completion of the DL Instructor Induction Course (Part A and B) awards a University Certificate aligned with European practice. Specifically, the DL Instructor Induction Course has been developed based on the grounds of the Digital Competences Framework (DigCompEdu). This course is also offered in collaboration with the University's Professional Development Center (P2DF) and it is part of the Professional development training requirements of the faculty members (full time and part time).</p>	<p>universities offer a 5 ECs UTQ certificates (~150 hours) – just in case they consider a full day event enough.</p>
<p>While the presentation by the DL Unit included several useful learning theories and learning design approaches, including motivational design, constructivism, connectivism, etc., it was not always easy to identify these elements in the induction course for the teachers. For motivational learning design especially, the EEC suggests looking into Keller's ARCS model (attention-relevance-confidence-satisfaction).</p>	<p>2.6. The Distance Learning Committee in collaboration with the Center of Innovation & Excellence in Teaching (CIET) is in the process of revising the DL Instructor Induction to make learning theories and learning design approaches explicit and assessable. We aim to provide a Design Rationale Table and Theory Tags (e.g., Constructivism, Connectivism, Col, SAMR, UDL) attached to examples, activities, and feedback practices. A new Theory-to-Design Map (matrix) is being developed to show where each theory/approach is taught and modelled, with annotated examples based on DLPF (e.g., Col, Salmon 5-stage, SAMR, UDL) and a micro-design assignment requiring instructors to label and justify the theory embedded in their weekly plan and assessment. We aim to also include Keller's ARCS model (Attention, Relevance,</p>	<p>Compliance</p> <p>Developing in the right direction,</p>

	Confidence, Satisfaction) in the aforementioned additions within our activities, feedback, and assessment).	
Regarding flexible learning paths and inclusion, it is not clear how this could be applied in the programme as the material shared seems to have one predetermined path designed by the teacher. Even though this path was meticulously designed with the collaboration of the DL Unit, alternative learning paths have not been presented.	2.7. The program is designed to follow a single curated pathway. This way ensures coherence, quality assurance, and equal opportunities of learning. The provision of flexible pathways is not foreseen, at the moment, by the Regulatory Framework (CYQAA). The University does not employ any flexible pathways, and this will be further examined when it is included as an option in the regulatory framework.	Compliance Because CYQAA does not enforce it.
According to the EEC's view, complaints are usually extreme measures and students do not tend to expose themselves like that, while a course evaluation session at the end of the course is common for conventional courses. Therefore, the EEC suggests the inclusion of additional student-feedback moments during each course so that corrective actions would be possible.	2.8. In addition to the measures that are already in place (end of the course and instructor evaluation by the students, 3rd week - Ready to go Check by CIET and DLU, and the end of the semester Quality Control Check by CIET and the Quality Assurance Committee of the University), the University is introducing a mid-course evaluation, after the 6 th week of the semester. Through this mid-evaluation process the students have the opportunity to report any issues and/or complaints. Also, CIET enhances the use of Data Analytics in order to collect information about the quality of the content material and student engagement and interaction with the course material, the other students and the instructor (s).	Compliance
Despite the positive elements of having a digital trail within a forum, using a forum can be outdated and lacking interactivity. Discussion rooms, or group chats could be seen	2.9. In addition to the discussion forums, CIET is in the process of updating its guidelines to the DL instructors to enable/include course discussion rooms and group chats within their courses	Compliance

as a more modern and common tools by the students.	to further enhance collaboration, communication, interaction and engagement.	
One issue for attention is the individual contribution in group assignments. Students may need additional guidance to work effectively and productively in collaborative settings. Peer assessment is also in place and it is also positive, but it is happening at the end of the course, when no corrective action is possible. Especially for a DL programme, more checks throughout the timeline could be useful.	2.10. The University is preparing a specific section at the DLICS course (0 credit course) the newcomers DL students attend, in regards to collaborative activities and group work. Specifically, student's role and contribution in group work so as to be well prepared to effectively and productively work together. Additionally, the Center for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching (CIET), provides the instructors with a team template for group work and other collaborative activities and a checklist to be used by the students when they participate in online group work and other collaborative activities. Transferring peer-assessment process mid-semester provides the opportunity for corrective measures and actions.	Compliance However, the focus here is only on instructions to students and not measures to check who did what. For example, in online shared documents such as Google Docs, it is easy to see who wrote what. It would be preferable to include measures to check who did what.
Regarding assessment, the EEC stresses the need for an aligned and coherent assessment procedure for all students throughout the whole programme. As such, it is advised that teacher meetings, either formal or informal (e.g., brown bags) would occur often.	2.11. It is important to mention that the assessment is aligned and coherent across distance learning programs of the University (given the guidelines from the regulatory authority). All courses include three (3) types of assessment: summative, continuous and self-assessment. For the summative assessment, all courses have a final exam of 50%. For the continuous assessment, every course has 2 assignments and 2 online interactive/ collaborative activities. For the self-assessment, every week/unit is self-assessment activities are provided (i.e. self-assessment quiz, reflective journals, checklists). As per the University guidelines,	Compliance

	DL program coordinators are expected to schedule regular meetings with the teaching staff of the program throughout the semester (where the parameter of assessment is addressed along with other issues: (a) a start-of-semester (formal), (b) bi-weekly and/or monthly meetings (either formal or informal) for emerging issues, and (c) an end-of-semester (formal).	
Regarding the demonstration of mastery of intended learning outcomes (ILOs), the programme advertises a long list of outcomes per course. Curriculum mapping - the way and level in which each course contributed to the ILOs was not part of the application but was provided upon request. Still, it is unclear how and to what degree each course will actually contribute to each ILO. Specifically, the assessment is focusing primarily on knowledge acquisition and near transfer. Therefore, it is not clear how ILOs, such as cultivating critical thinking, are addressed in the different courses. Moreover, the interactive activities, which are mostly closed-type items, and group assignments (e.g., case studies) may offer limited space for students to exercise and demonstrate critical thinking. Finally, many of the ILOs seem to be focused on the subject matter (knowledge acquisition) and not so much on the other two levels required by CYQAA, namely skills and competences. It is strongly advised that a pragmatic approach will be followed in the ILOs and the curriculum mapping.	2.12. We accept and adopt the EEC recommendation. Please refer to Annex 1 – Course descriptions and Study Guides and Annex 2 – Learning Outcomes Mapping.	Compliance
The courses follow the same structure regarding available information, assessment criteria, and overall style. This is very positive and can be attributed to	2.13. We would like to thank the EEC Committee for its constructive feedback and for recognizing the strong alignment, consistency, and	Compliance

<p>the fact that the teachers have to work very closely with the learning design experts of the DL Unit. Having said that, the EEC would like to stress again that the depth of information provided in the application was not adequate and it was the presentations and discussions that covered the gaps presented in the application. If a revised application is needed by CYQAA, the EEC would like to emphasize the importance of adding all relevant information in the application.</p>	<p>collaboration between the teaching staff, CIET and the Distance Learning (DL) Unit. We would like to clarify that the University followed the guidelines given by the regulatory authority for the application development. Also, we would like to express our satisfaction that the EEC acknowledges that the presentations and the discussions that took place during its visit addressed its questions and covered the gaps.</p>	
<p>A refresher of the induction course, or an advanced version of it, could be offered periodically.</p>	<p>2.14. An advanced version of the DL Instructors Induction Course (Part B) is under development and is expected to be offered in Spring 2026. The DL Instructors Induction Course is offered every semester for the newcomers. Additional professional development trainings are scheduled 1) given any new technological developments, 2) when the University identifies the need and 3) upon request by the DL coordinators and/or instructors. Since the DL Instructors Induction Course is developed and delivered as a self – paced course, it is already offered periodically.</p>	<p>Compliance</p> <p>Developing in the right direction.</p>
<p>One issue that emerged and caused serious concerns was the involvement of students in research activities. In principle, Master's students are expected to develop some research skills, including searching for information, validating sources, performing literature reviews, applying or designing solutions/interventions, and so on. During the discussion with the students, it was surprising to hear that the apparent consensus across the board was that they did not have to search for literature in any of their courses and that they were</p>	<p>2.15. A re-structuring of the curriculum of the programme is adopted: The module "Thesis I: Research Methodology and Thesis Preparation (DLNLT511)" is no longer part of the programme and a new compulsory module named "Legal Research Methodology" will be taught in the first semester of studies. As mentioned, this new course will be compulsory for all students and offered in the first semester, in order for them to be equipped with all the necessary</p>	<p>Compliance</p>

unaccustomed to having to using the library to locate materials in paper or digital formats themselves. The implicit suggestion was that they felt they only needed to use the chapters and articles provided by their teachers in the courses. While this finding was inevitably based on a small sample, this is an issue on which the EEC has a strong and clear opinion that research activities must be part of the learning design and the students should be encouraged and supported in doing their own research, whether or not they intend to write a dissertation as part of their study. Linked to the ILOs and the critical thinking requirement, providing all the sources pre-emptively, without a requirement to extend the bibliography, seems like a clear impediment of students' opportunity to develop their critical thinking.

epistemological and other necessary and appropriate knowledge for attending successfully a Master's programme in the field of Law. This course will induct all students to the main elements of Research in the field of Law and encourage them to produce in original research within the assignments of the programme. Original research will be also encouraged for those students, who will opt for writing a thesis. It is noted, that after the aforementioned modification of the structure, Thesis corresponds to 30 ECTS and the new curriculum is formed as seen in Annex 3 - Revised Course Distribution per semester. Furthermore, as discussed during onsite visit, we would like to re-confirm that research activities are part of the learning design in the framework of the assignments demanded for each course. Within the framework of the assignments, students are required to conduct both bibliographical and case-law research. The material made available to students through the platform are structured and designed as a foundation for further independent study and research-oriented exploration of the relevant topics. It will in no way constitute a restrictive framework for exclusive study or assessment. At the same time, participate in research groups, scientific activities, and projects developed by the teaching staff in connection with the postgraduate

	<p>program, as outlined during the program presentation.</p> <p>An example of research document that includes the contribution of some students can be accessed here.</p> <p>Furthermore, all distance learning students have access to the library resources. Full-text electronic materials are accessible from via the University's VPN. The University has subscriptions to major international databanks – ScienceDirect (Elsevier), Springer Nature, Oxford University Press, ProQuest, Cambridge University Press, Wiley Online Library, etc.</p> <p>Below you can find an indicative list of our current subscriptions to publishers and databases:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ACM Digital Library 2. Biomed Central 3. Cambridge Core (Cambridge University Press) 4. Clarksons Research 5. CYS (Cyprus Organisation for Standardisation) 6. Grove Art (Oxford University Press) 7. Grove Music (Oxford University Press) 8. IEEEExplore 9. Kluwer Law Online 10. LEGINET (Legal Portal) 11. Oxford Reference Online (Oxford University Press) 12. ProQuest Central 13. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses 14. SAGE (incl. Digital Archive) 15. ScienceDirect (ELSEVIER Freedom Collection) 16. Springer Core & Optimum (Springer, Palgrave & Academic journals) 17. Springer Nature eBook Collections 	
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>18. Taylor & Francis (incl. CRC Press and Routledge)</p> <p>19. Wiley (Journals with Database Model)</p> <p>20. Wiley eBooks</p> <p>Additionally, students may use extended bibliography with the opportunity to further develop their research skills.</p> <p>Below are links related to indicative content of the databases (titles from Journals and eBooks) that are recommend to law students:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BAILII - British and Irish Legal Information Institute (open access) 2. Cambridge Core - Law Journals and eBooks 3. Cy Law - Κυπριακή Πηγή Νομικής Πληροφόρησης (open access) 4. EUR-Lex - European Union Law (open access) 5. Kluwer Law Online - Journals 6. Kluwer Law Online - Encyclopaedias 7. Kluwer Law Online - Manuals 8. Leginet - Cyprus Legal Portal 9. OAPEN - Law eBooks (open access) 10. ProQuest Central - Law Journals 11. Springer Nature - IT Law, Media Law, Intellectual Property Journals 12. Springer Nature - Law eBooks 13. Taylor & Francis - Law Journals 14. Wiley Online Library - Journals and eBooks <p>It is important to clearly state that, as members of the Cyprus Academic Libraries Consortium (CCL), we are in the process of considering our participation in a joint agreement with Westlaw International Academic (Thomson Reuters) in the new calendar year.</p>	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

3. Teaching staff (ESG 1.5)

EEC's final recommendations and comments on the HEI's response

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	EEC's final recommendations and comments on the HEI's response
The programme has an ambitious teaching and student support agenda, given the number of teaching staff deployed. While staff indicate that they are happy to manage the workload required, it is recommended that the School/program have a formalised process for addressing the unexpected absence of key teaching staff, beyond the current, apparently ad hoc, arrangements.	3.1. It is clarified that, in addition to announcing all synchronous tele-sessions (days and times) at the beginning of each semester, the University has a formal procedure for handling the unexpected absence of key teaching staff. In such cases, the instructor promptly informs students and the Programme Coordinator, a new date and time for the tele-session is agreed (within the same or the next available teaching week), and the revised schedule is immediately communicated to students via LMS announcements, e-mail and an updated LMS calendar entry. This procedure is aligned with the University Regulations.	<p>Compliance</p> <p>It is very good to know how unexpected absences are addressed and communicated to students. However, the EEC's comment and recommendation were slightly different. The EEC wondered whether the University has a system in place for e.g. relief /replacement teaching staff (other than ad hoc collegial support) to be engaged when a key teaching person is unexpectedly absent for a longer period of time. The action described in 3.1 depends on deferring a class to another date but in case of long-term absence this may not be possible.</p>

4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification (ESG 1.4)

EEC's final recommendations and comments on the HEI's response

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	EEC's final recommendations and comments on the HEI's response
Frederick University's admission criteria for the master's programme are satisfactory, considering academic qualifications, language proficiency, and professional experience. However, continuous review and adaptation to evolving educational landscapes are recommended.	<p>4.1. Admission criteria for the programs comply with the general criteria of the university as well as with specialized, program-specific criteria. These criteria are described in the program evaluation reports and remain in force throughout the certification period of each program. Minor deviations and/or modifications from these program-specific criteria may be made following a proposal by the relevant department to the University Senate and subsequent approval by the latter. Additionally, Admission criteria for the master's programme are reviewed on a regular basis within the framework of the University's programme review and enhancement processes, taking into account developments in the field, as well as feedback from applicants, students and employers. Where appropriate, criteria are updated (e.g. clarification of language requirements, recognition of emerging qualifications or professional profiles) to ensure that the programme remains responsive to the evolving educational landscape and continues to attract suitably prepared candidates.</p> <p>4.2. The University has implemented comprehensive quality assurance policies and procedures to support the</p>	Compliance

	<p>ongoing review and enhancement of the program in response to developments in education and legislative changes, one aspect of which is the continuous review and adjustment of program's admission criteria.</p> <p>The provision of an enhanced explanation of a dynamic quality assurance process can be found below:</p> <p>University Quality Assurance System:</p> <p>The Internal Quality Committee of the University has developed and applies consistently the Quality Assurance Policy of the University. The Internal Quality Policy concerns the following four broad areas: (a) its programs of study and teaching, (b) the research output and the creation of new knowledge, (c) the management of the University and the administrative services and (d) the connection with society and the social contribution.</p> <p>The internal quality system includes the processes and methodologies which (a) define, monitor, analyse and evaluate the quality indicators, (b) identify weaknesses and opportunities for further improvement and (c) apply remedial measures.</p> <p>The internal quality process is achieved through annual reporting from all parties involved in the operation of the University. The internal quality processes concerning the academic staff, the student performance and the programs of study are achieved through student questionnaires and self-</p>	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>evaluation reports. The Internal Quality Committee monitors the implementation of the internal quality process and reports to the Senate every two years.</p> <p>Internal Quality System for the programme:</p> <p>The internal quality system for the specific program begins with a reporting process achieved through a number of report templates and questionnaires. These templates include the following:</p> <p>a) Student Course Evaluation (IQC100): This is an online questionnaire completed by the students at the end of each semester. This questionnaire consists of two parts, the first part consists of questions concerning the specific course such as the course student workload, course facilities etc, while the second part consists of questions concerning the instructor of the program, such as teaching methods employed, teaching material, assessment etc. The first part of the questionnaire is used by the Program Coordinator during the program revision. The second of the questionnaire is used by the instructor for analysis and self-improvement, as well as the Program Coordinator and the Department Chair during the Faculty Appraisal process.</p> <p>b) Faculty Course Evaluation (IQC101). This report is completed by the instructor of each course and submitted to the Program Coordinator at the end of each semester. This report provides information on</p>	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>the teaching methods used, the teaching material, the assessment methods and the students' evaluation and results.</p> <p>c) Program Self Evaluation (IQC104): This report is compiled annually by the Program Coordinator and submitted to the Chair of the Department to be used as part of the Departmental Report. This report emphasizes on students' data such as number of students, origin and gender of students etc, on students' assessment and performance, on the curriculum and on the infrastructure and facilities of the program.</p> <p>d) Faculty Activity Report (IQC105): This report is submitted annually by each faculty member to the Chair of the Department. It provides information on the teaching activities, research activities, administrative duties, staff development activities, staff mobility and service to society.</p> <p>e) Faculty Appraisal Report (IQC106): Faculty appraisal is carried out by the Chair of the Department and the Program Coordinator and concerns all teaching staff of the program. It is based on the results of the Student Course Evaluation questionnaires (IQC100) and the information provided in the Faculty Activity Report (IQC105). An action plan is decided between the appraisers and the appraisee, with its implementation monitored by the Program Coordinator and</p>	
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>examined during the next faculty appraisal cycle.</p> <p>All programmes of study at the University are monitored and evaluated systematically and periodically. The evaluation process of the programmes of study involves the university's faculty members, graduates and students, Administrative Services, and when necessary, external experts such as Research and Teaching Staff of other universities, researchers, experts in developing programmes, members of professional bodies or scientific bodies, government agencies and services. The Departmental Quality Committee and the Internal Quality Committee of the University have a significant role in the internal evaluation and the monitoring of programmes of study. The internal evaluation of the programme is based on criteria and quality indicators, as defined by the University's Quality Assurance Policy.</p> <p>The information about our policies and procedures are publicly available in our website here and here.</p>	
<p>Furthermore, given that the student cohort may have different disciplinary backgrounds, the EEC highly encourages providing a legal methodology course for students that come into the programme with another (even if related) field of specialisation.</p>	<p>4.3. We accept and adopt the EEC recommendation. The University has established an introductory course, which will be included in the admission criteria and will be mandatory for applicants without a legal background. See Annex 4 referred to the introductory seminar. Moreover, see the remarks made in 2.15</p>	<p>Compliance</p>

5. Learning resources and student support (ESG 1.6)

EEC's final recommendations and comments on the HEI's response

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	EEC's final recommendations and comments on the HEI's response
From the on-site discussions it appeared that teaching staff do not have fixed office hours for DL students. The EEC suggests that it is a good practice to have fixed office hours where students can reach the teaching staff: this provides clarity to students, reduces the threshold to reach out when help is needed and is a more effective use of the teaching staffs' time.	5.1.All instructors are required to schedule and publish one fixed online office hour every week (preferably different than the weeks of the synchronous tele sessions, in order to achieve continuous communication and interaction). Additionally, a 48-hour response window for messages/emails, is already practiced under the Distance Learning Pedagogical Framework. The online office hours schedule is published in each Study Guide, at the courses' LMS pages, and on the LMS calendar.	Compliance However, the institution is encouraged to increase the number of office hours as one hour may be rather limited for students.

6. Additional for doctoral programmes (ALL ESG)

EEC's final recommendations and comments on the HEI's response

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	EEC's final recommendations and comments on the HEI's response
N/A	N/A	Choose level of compliance:

7. Eligibility (Joint programmes) (ALL ESG)

EEC's final recommendations and comments on the HEI's response

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	EEC's final recommendations and comments on the HEI's response
N/A	N/A	Choose level of compliance:

C. Conclusions and final remarks

The EEC must provide final conclusions and remarks, with emphasis on the correspondence with the EQF.

EEC's final conclusions and remarks

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	EEC's final recommendations and comments on the HEI's response
1. Study programme:		
Overall, the new programme described aligns well with the guidelines of the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) in all relevant aspects. The programme has a good quality assurance process, involving internal and external reviews, feedback solicitation from various stakeholders, and end of course evaluations. Recommended action 1: introduce formal mid-course evaluation to complement end of course evaluations.	Please refer to response 2.8	Compliance
Recommended action 2: introduce formal ways of organising constructive alignment between learning outcomes, the content and assessment methods. The programme title 'Law of new technologies and e-government' gives space for multiple interpretations. One interpretation of the title is that the programme has two themes as its focus: a. law of new technologies and b. e-government. Following this interpretation the programme content reflects on law of new technologies (e.g. on cybersecurity and artificial intelligence) in compulsory courses; and e-government is	Please refer to response 1.1 and 2.12.	Compliance

<p>barely touched upon. This does not seem to sufficiently reflect the title of the programme.</p> <p>Another interpretation, supported by the teaching staff during the on-site visit is that the e-government (in the title) needs to be understood as 'governance' and that the first three compulsory courses reflect this governance approach (EU policies in the digital sector; European Protection of fundamental rights in the digital era; law of digital economy). If this is the preferred interpretation, then the EEC recommends changing the programme title to 'Law of new technologies and their governance'.</p>		
<p>Recommended action 3: ensure that the title of the programme reflects the content of the programme: either change the programme title or the content of the programme.</p> <p>The programme is designed to address contemporary challenges in legal frameworks related to new technologies, aiming to produce professionals with a deep understanding of European technology regulation. The objectives align with the evolving needs of society. The designers of the programme have been in contact with external stakeholders and are inspired by the needs of practitioners. The link with the world of legal practice is very valuable and should be maintained.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response 1.1.</p>	<p>Compliance</p>
<p>Recommended action 4: maintain and strengthen the relations with practitioners to renew and keep the course content up-to-date and to set up internships for the DL students in the different practice areas.</p>	<p>We agree with the Committee's recommendation to maintain and strengthen the relations with the practitioners. The University has an established quality assurance process which can be seen in response 4.2 that actively incorporates the insights and expertise of</p>	<p>Compliance</p>

	our external stakeholders through the continuous review and updating of course content. This ongoing engagement ensures that our curriculum remains academically rigorous, professionally relevant, and aligned with current developments and best practices in the field.	
<p>The course descriptions and study guides are at an advanced stage. No completed DL course has been yet prepared but the study guides give a good idea of what is being planned. The courses are very ambitious in nature as can be seen from the extensive number of learning outcomes for each course. This needs revision and in line with Recommended action 2, the programme learning outcome and the learning outcomes for each course need to be reduced and aligned.</p> <p>Furthermore, the EEC is concerned with what seems to be repetitions of particular topics in multiple courses (e.g., the GDPR and other data protection regulations appearing in multiple courses).</p>	<p>Adopting the EEC recommendation, all course descriptions and study guides have been revised in terms of learning outcomes. Please refer to Annex 2.</p> <p>We would like to clarify that while certain topics (such as GDPR) recur across the curriculum, each course applies a distinct analytical perspective. For example, DLNLT501 analyzes personal data within a regulatory framework, whereas DLNLT502 examines it as a right worthy of protection.</p>	Compliance
<p>Recommended action 5: set up formal coordination meetings discussing content of each course to ensure a clear learning pathway for students following the programme.</p> <p>The University also handles the extensive challenge of sustaining the high standards of quality assurance, maintaining relevance to societal and technological developments, and actively involving students in programme development; this requires continuous effort and analysis, which the University and the Department of Law undertake with great commitment.</p> <p>To address these challenges, the University continuously analyses</p>	Please refer to response 4.2	Compliance

<p>student feedback, evaluates programme outcomes, and adapts to emerging needs. The commitment to preventing student dropouts and providing a supportive learning environment necessitates ongoing monitoring and improvement.</p> <p>The EEC had the impression that the research learning goal of the programme, especially when students opt not to undertake a thesis, seems to be a bit vague.</p> <p>Furthermore, it seems that only one course (Cybersecurity and AI) has a substantial technical knowledge component (i.e. how does the particular technology that is the subject of discussion actually work). Some more information concerning the technical knowledge content of the programme could be helpful</p>	<p>Please refer to response 2.15</p> <p>Apart from the course corresponding to AI and Cybersecurity, no other technical knowledge is considered necessary.</p>	
<p>Recommended action 6: strengthen the research skills components in the programme courses by explaining clearly to the students what is expected in the writing assignments of the courses.</p>	<p>Please refer to response 2.15</p>	<p>Compliance</p>
<p>Recommended action 7: consider providing, perhaps in the interactive sessions of some of the courses, more information on technical issues of the new technologies under investigation in the programme.</p> <p>As the programme is yet to be launched, the University's success in meeting these commitments will be demonstrated through its ability to utilize student feedback effectively, make informed programme enhancements, and ensure that the programme remains aligned with the evolving landscape of technology and legal frameworks. Continuous self-assessment and a proactive approach to refining the</p>	<p>Although the programme has not yet been launched, the University has already defined a clear quality enhancement cycle that will evidence these commitments in practice. Student feedback will be systematically collected through mid- and end-of-semester online evaluations and targeted surveys, complemented by LMS analytics (engagement, completion rates). The Programme Committee, in collaboration with CIET, will review this evidence on the spot as well as by the end of each semester, agree on specific improvement actions, and monitor their implementation in subsequent semesters. Alignment with evolving technologies and legal frameworks (e.g., data protection, accessibility, AI in education) will be ensured through continuous monitoring of institutional, national and EU developments</p>	<p>Compliance</p>

educational experience will be key to maintaining the programme's effectiveness and meeting the outlined goals.	by CIET and University's Quality Assurance Committee. Any required updates to tools, platforms, or pedagogical guidelines will be incorporated into the programme structure, supported by staff development activities and reflected in updated study guides and course developed at the Moodle-LMS platform. In this way, continuous self-assessment and proactive refinement will be embedded in the life cycle of the programme.	
Recommended action 8: implement a continuous self-assessment process and set up regular course alignment and revision meetings between teaching staff and external stakeholders.	Please refer to response 4.1.	Compliance
2. Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment		
The programme is very relevant and actual , not only regarding its field of study and research, but also regarding the dynamic nature of new technologies and their regulation. Furthermore, it is especially suited to effective delivery through the chosen distance learning method. The programme aligns well with the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) , reflection on policy making at a European level and its translation and implementation in the national context (both in Cyprus and in Greece). The well-developed e-learning infrastructure supports student-teacher interaction, utilizing tools like Zoom and Moodle. The e-learning methodology is appropriate for the particular programme of study. The programme design follows the guidelines of CYQAA and ensures weekly interaction to an adequate	Please refer or response 2.2.	Compliance See note in reply to response to 2.2

<p>degree. Nevertheless, improvements could be made to clarify policies and the way they are enforced during the runtime of a course so that corrective actions could be made possible. The programme design currently includes five synchronous plenary sessions in each course, which is the minimum requirement set by CYQAA. This includes Week 0, though, in which no content-related issue is covered. Therefore, the students will have only four remaining synchronous sessions with their teacher in their courses.</p> <p>Recommended action 9: The EEC strongly suggests that Week 0 should not be counted as part of the minimum requirement, and an additional, course-related session is added in the programme. The student support services, including counselling and career advice centres, address diverse student needs. The current responsibility of monitoring student involvement lies with instructors/teaching staff. A more institutional approach to monitoring student participation and needs that does not require students to reach out, but rather that the institution reaches out to them, could support student well-being more effectively.</p>		
<p>Recommended action 10: consider using more learning analytics by the DLU to support the ad hoc monitoring of students by teaching staff. The pedagogical model emphasizes multimodality, various teaching and learning methods such as interactivity, as well as a well thought out system</p>	<p>We fully acknowledge the added value of learning analytics and the University already uses them to support the ad hoc monitoring of students. However, their use is expected to be enhanced in order to systematically strengthen students' monitoring and support. In collaboration with CIET, teaching staff (by the time the course is set up in Moodle-LMS) has access to LMS analytics dashboards (e.g., log-ins, participation in</p>	<p>Compliance</p>

<p>of formative and evaluative assessments.</p> <p>In conclusion, the programme has a good foundation. Regular reviews and a culture of innovation will contribute in preparing students for the intersection of law and digital technologies.</p>	<p>forums, completion of activities, assessment performance) and predefined indicators and rubrics are used (based on the Pedagogical Framework of the University) to identify students at risk of non-completion or disengagement. These data trigger timely, personalised interventions (e.g., follow-up messages, clarification sessions, referral to support services), complementing the programme's multimodal, interactive pedagogical model and rich system of formative and summative assessments. Furthermore, aggregated analytics reports (mid-semester, end of the semester) feed into the regular programme review process, informing decisions on course design, assessment load and digital tools. This data-informed, iterative approach underpins a culture of continuous improvement and innovation, ensuring that the programme remains pedagogically robust and responsive to emerging developments at the intersection of law and digital technologies.</p>	
<p>3. Teaching Staff</p>		
<p>The teaching staff on the programme are all highly qualified members of staff, mostly with specialisations in some areas of technology regulation or law and technology. This can also be seen from the publication lists. There is also a conscious drive for funded research projects. This is very important as research projects can also be used to engage students in practical research training and work. The qualified teaching staff also work or contribute to the teaching in external institutions (e.g., in Greek, German universities to mention but a few) and European Union institutions (e.g., OLAF and other EU agencies). Periodic assessments of workload distribution and faculty</p>	<p>There is already a clear policy in place on teaching workload according to which the workload distribution includes both conventional and DL courses. Additionally, reduction of teaching load is given according to the University's regulations based on faculty's member research work and accomplishments, as well as any administrative positions (i.e. Head of the Department/Dean) and contribution to the University.</p> <p>We acknowledge the importance of balancing effective student monitoring with realistic staff workload. In collaboration with CIET, the Programme's Committee will continue its current practices as well as further enhance the use of LMS learning analytics (dashboards, alerts, progress reports) so that routine tracking of participation, activity completion and assessment performance is largely automated. This allows teaching staff to</p>	<p>Compliance</p>

<p>satisfaction contribute to a positive teaching environment. However, the workload for the Law Department is high, too.</p> <p>Recommended action 11: reduce teaching staff obligations to monitor student progress by using learning analytics tools or support of DLU.</p> <p>Frederick University provides a self-paced learning module for teaching staff involved in DL. It also provides different training opportunities that staff can choose from.</p>	<p>focus their efforts on targeted pedagogical interventions with students flagged as at risk, rather than manual, time-consuming monitoring. In addition, Frederick University already supports staff through a self-paced DL training module and a range of optional workshops/webinars. Extra trainings will be offered in order to be further aligned with the programme's needs, including specific training on interpreting learning analytics and using them to provide timely, efficient support to students.</p>	
<p>Recommended action 12: consider introducing / assigning ECTS/certification for staff training.</p> <p>The multifaceted approach to teaching performance assessment, including quality control and student feedback is well designed. Incorporating external stakeholder input ensures alignment with real-world demands.</p> <p>- The commitment to the synergy of teaching and research efforts is to be further encouraged. While it is commendable that separate research achievement KPIs for the law department have been made, this should not lead the department members to keep on doing 'more of the same' but more ambitious approaches to involvement in external research funding should be further pushed. Research-led teaching best benefits students. The encouragement of interdisciplinary research projects and the strengthening of the link between research outputs and courses enhances the academic environment for the faculty and the students.</p>	<p>Please refer to response 2.5</p> <p>We appreciate the EEC's positive remarks.</p> <p>The Law Department fully embraces the EEC's recommendation to further strengthen the synergy between teaching and research and has already embedded multiple mechanisms that promote a research-led academic environment. Members of the academic staff serve on editorial boards of esteemed international journals, reinforcing the department's outward-looking research culture. Research outputs from major initiatives, such as the EU-funded JUSTICE Programme "TrEAJus" on GDPR training, as well as the internally funded collective volume on "The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Human Rights," are systematically integrated into teaching, particularly in areas such as digital transformation, data protection, and human rights. Staff involvement in European and national bodies including the European Data Protection Board, the European Commission, OLAF, and the</p>	<p>Compliance</p> <p>But see note in reply to response 2.5</p> <p>Compliance</p>

National Committee of Bioethics further enriches course material with real-world perspectives. The recently awarded European funded Jean Monnet Module “EUDACY” (Application of the European Digital Agenda), under the ERASMUS+ program, exemplifies the department’s commitment to interdisciplinary and policy-relevant research, directly feeding into the core courses of the proposed LLM. As far as the implementation of the aforementioned Jean Monnet Module please see its official site: <https://eudacy.frederick.ac.cy/>

Students are also actively engaged in research through assignments involving case law analysis, case studies, and assessments of national and European digital policies, thereby developing critical and research skills while contributing to the faculty’s scholarly activities. In terms of external research funding, the department has participated in significant projects such as the JUSTICE Programme “TrEAJus” (2017–2019) with a departmental budget of €112,469.84, and the Horizon Europe project “safeGUARDing biodiversity and critical ecosystem services” (2022–2025), with a departmental budget of €18,000. Furthermore, as presented during the onside visit the Department has established a structured strategy for increasing participation in competitive European research programmes. Academic staff is actively involved in the preparation and submission of proposals under Horizon Europe, Erasmus+, Digital Europe and CERV, often in collaboration with other departments and international partners. These ongoing efforts aim to diversify external funding sources and to foster new interdisciplinary research clusters that will further enhance the Department’s research-led teaching environment. Indicatively, members of the Department have already participated in the submission of a Horizon Europe proposal under the acronym **CLEAR AI - Cognitive Legal and Empowerment Analysis for Resistance to Authoritarian Intelligence**, involving a large consortium of international university

<p>Utilising visiting teaching staff enriches the programme and brings in aspects from legal practice or law in practice that is indispensable for student learning.</p> <p>Enhancements to the student evaluation process that involve systematic feedback analysis and a feedback loop for continuous improvement are greatly encouraged by the EEC.</p> <p>In conclusion, Frederick University's Department of Law demonstrates a strong commitment to quality education. Emphasizing continuous improvement, periodic evaluations, and proactive measures for industry alignment will further strengthen the programme being proposed</p>	<p>partners. The proposal includes a projected budget of €147,925 for Frederick University, further demonstrating the Department's active engagement in competitive European research funding initiatives.</p> <p>Building on these achievements, the department remains committed to pursuing more ambitious research initiatives and expanding external funding opportunities, for a robust, research-driven academic environment.</p> <p>We would like to thank the EEC for the positive remarks.</p> <p>Please refer to response 2.8</p>	<p>Compliance</p>
<p>4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification</p>		
<p>Frederick University's admission criteria for the Master's programme are satisfactory, considering academic qualifications, language proficiency, and professional experience. However, continuous review and adaptation to evolving educational landscapes are recommended.</p>	<p>Please refer to response 4.1. and 4.3.</p>	<p>Compliance</p>
<p>Recommended action 13: consider providing a legal methodology course for students that come into the programme</p>	<p>Please see Annex 4 and the response 2.15, and response 4.3</p>	<p>Compliance</p>

<p>with another (even if related) field of specialisation.</p> <p>The recognition of prior learning and work experiences aligns with European standards and the Bologna Process Declaration.</p> <p>Concerning the students' workload the evaluation committee had the impression that the students may feel some pressure because they have to work very hard during the programme.</p>		
<p>Recommended action 14: reconsider the assessment workload and distribution of courses being offered in the same semester.</p> <p>The University's commitment to the Bologna Process Declaration includes providing a diploma supplement in line with European and international standards, demonstrating compliance with ESG/EQF-Standards.</p> <p>Regular reviews and updates of the diploma supplement content can further enhance its relevance.</p> <p>In conclusion, Frederick University, Department of Law, has also met the ESG/EQF-Standards in the fourth area of evaluation. The recommendations focus on continual evaluation and adaptation to ensure sustained alignment with international educational benchmarks.</p>	<p>The assessment percentages of the semester assignments per course, as well as the number of assignments and the number of compulsory courses per semester find themselves in accordance with the approved university standards, which are in force for the other DL master's programs, as well as with the State legislation in force.</p> <p>The topics of the assignments in correlation with the form of cooperation between students and teachers in each course during the semester reassure the feasibility of quality studies in a non-stressful and - thus - effective and efficient academic schedule and study path.</p>	<p>Compliance</p>
<p>5. Learning Resources and Student support</p>		
<p>The evaluation of Frederick University's master's degree programme, particularly in the context of EQF standards, reveals a robust and well-established infrastructure. The extensive facilities, including numerous buildings, classrooms, laboratories, and a well-equipped library with international</p>	<p>As proven by the operation of all the other online Master's programs provided by the department, the Department systematically develops group online sessions and other online events (i.e. invitation of special guests and speakers), where students and teachers are given the chance to develop parallel interactions, know each other better and cultivate a fruitful, students-friendly "learning ecosystem".</p>	<p>Compliance</p> <p>But see note in reply to response 5.1.</p>

<p>affiliations, provide a commendable foundation for the programme.</p> <p>The DL infrastructure is appropriate for the offering of this programme. The E-xcellence certification by EADTU is commendable.</p> <p>The EEC acknowledges the programme's strong support structures for students, including counselling services, flexibility in the study programme, and accommodations for special needs. The EEC would recommend that the University take more proactive measures to support student well-being and in ensuring more inclusion of DL students in the life of the university and the Department of Law in particular.</p> <p>Recommended action 15: take more proactive action in ensuring students' well-being while studying online.</p> <p>In the overall assessment, Frederick University meets the ESG/EQF standards.</p>	<p>Finally, we would like to sincerely thank the External Evaluation Committee for their constructive review of the proposed programme "LLM Law of New Technologies". All suggestions made by the EEC have been adopted and implemented as seen by the answers throughout sessions 1-5 as well as in the conclusions and final remarks.</p>	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

D. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Jeanne Mifsud Bonnici	
Andrew J. Charlesworth	
Emily Mary Weitzenboeck	
Pantelis Papadopoulos	
Athanasia Eliadou	

Date: 02 January 2026

